REMARKS

The outstanding office action sets forth both a Section 102 rejection based on Johnson and a Section 103 rejection based on Johnson and Ishida. It is believed that the Section 102 rejection has been withdrawn and, instead, the Examiner is relying on the combination of Johnson and Ishida as set forth on page 3 of the office action.

Claim 1 calls for a catch that retains the antenna in the retracted position in said track, said catch being spring biased.

The office action points out that Ishida teaches a cantilevered leaf spring 28. However, this spring does not retain any antenna in a retracted position. First of all, Ishida does not relate to an antenna. Ishida relates to a PC card. The problem that Ishida is trying to overcome is that when an injector button is projecting outwardly from the case while the PC card is loaded in its slot, the button can be inadvertently operated.

Thus, in Ishida, the idea is to lock the button in a retracted position, not to lock an antenna or even the PC card. This is explicitly explained in column 2, lines 32-40. There it is explained that the PC card is inserted into the receiving cavity of the housing. The card pushes the receiving unit rearwardly which in turn pushes the ejector bar 4 forwardly. At this point, the intermediate bar 10 is biased on a side of the ejector button section 20 and the cam follower end 30 of the spring member 28 is at the lock position. According to Ishida, "consequently, the ejector button is kept at the rearwardly depressed locked position while the PC card is used." But a review of any of the Figures, and most clearly Figures 3 and 4, shows that locking the button section 20 has no possible effect on the intermediate section 10, the lever 5 or the bar 4. Thus, nothing about the locking engagement of the button section 20 has any locking affect on any antenna, much less the PC card. The idea here is to lock the button against inadvertent operation, not to lock the PC card.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is requested since it is pointed out that Johnson does not teach the claimed catch.

Likewise, claim 11 calls for providing a resiliently biased cam follower to ride in said track and to control the position of said antenna as it moves between retracted and extended positions.

In the reference, the biased spring element 28 does not control the position of the antenna as it rides in the track, it locks the position of the button. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 calls for a track engaging element, said element laterally spaced with respect to the coil spring to enable the antenna to be guided as it is pushed to its extended position, said track engaging element being a cantilevered leaf spring.

The so-called track engaging element in Ishida does not enable the antenna to be guided as it is pushed to the extended position. The element in Ishida simply locks the button or unlocks the button, but has no guiding function. In other words, the card is in no way guided by any track engaging element.

In view of these remarks, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/12/03

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]